arXiv:1601.03435v2 [q-fin.RM] 9 Feb 2016

ASYMPTOTIC ANALYSIS FOR OPTIMAL DIVIDENDS IN A DUAL RISK MODEL

ARASH FAHIM AND LINGJIONG ZHU

Abstract. The dual risk model is a popular model in finance and insurance, which is often used to model the wealth process of a venture capital or high tech company. Optimal dividends have been extensively studied in the literature for the dual risk model. It is well known that the value function of this optimal control problem does not yield closed-form solutions except in some special cases. In this paper, we study the asymptotics of the optimal dividends problem when the parameters of the model go to either zero or infinity. Our results provide insights to the optimal strategies and the optimal values when the parameters are extreme.

1. Introduction

In a dual risk model, the surplus or wealth process satisfies the dynamics:

$$dX_t = -\rho dt + dJ_t, \qquad X_0 = x > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\rho > 0$ is the cost of running the company and $J_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} Y_i$, is the stream of profits, where Y_i are i.i.d. $\mathbb{R}^+$ valued random variables with common probability density function $p(y)$, $y > 0$ and N_t is a Poisson process with intensity $\lambda > 0$. Y_i's often known as the innovation sizes or the random future revenues. The dual risk model can be used to model the wealth of a venture capital, where the running cost is deterministic and the revenues are stochastic, see e.g. [1, 4, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18] etc.

Let $\tau := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \leq 0\}$ be the ruin time of the company. Under the assumption that $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > \rho$, it is well known that the infinite-horizon ruin probability has the formulas $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau < \infty) = e^{-\alpha x}$, where x is the initial wealth X_0 of the company and α is the unique position value that satisfies the equation:

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Similarly, one can also compute the Laplace transform of the ruin time, $\mathbb{E}_x[e^{-\delta\tau}] = e^{-\beta x}$, where β is the unique positive value that satisfies the equation:

$$\beta\rho + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\beta y} - 1]p(y)dy - \delta = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

In the pioneering work by Avanzi et al. [4], they studied the optimal dividends problem in the dual risk model. Let $\delta > 0$ be the rate used in the discount factor and D_t be the rate of the dividend payment at time t by the company to the shareholders.

Date: 9 December 2015. *Revised:* 9 February 2016.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 91B30;91B70.
Key words and phrases. dual risk model, optimal dividends, asymptotic analysis.

Given a dividend payment strategy $D \in \mathcal{D}$, where the set of admissible dividend payment strategies $\mathcal{D}$ is the collection of all adapted nondecreasing càdlàg processes. Here notice that for a $D \in \mathcal{D}$, D_t is the cumulated dividend until time t. Then, the wealth process is given by

$$dX_t = -\rho dt - dD_t + dJ_t, \qquad X_0 = x > 0. \tag{1.4}$$

Avanzi et al. [4] studied the optimal dividend strategy for maximization the expected payments of all the future dividends to the shareholders until the time of the ruin, that is

$$V(x) := \sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right], \tag{1.5}$$

with initial wealth $X_0 = x$.

They proved that the optimal strategy is a barrier strategy, that is, there exists an optimal barrier $b > 0$, such that the optimal strategy is as follows. When the wealth process is below b, no dividend is paid out. When the wealth process jumps above the barrier b at the stopping time τ_b, $X_{\tau_b} - b$ is paid out as the dividends to the shareholders immediately and the surplus drops to the level b. The value function $V(x)$ satisfies the equations:

$$V'(x) = 1, \qquad \text{for any } x > b, \tag{1.6}$$

and for any $x < b$,

$$-\rho V'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [V(x+y) - V(x)] p(y) dy - \delta V(x) = 0, \tag{1.7}$$

with $V(0) = 0$. For $x > b$, it is clear that $V(x) = x - b + V(b)$ and hence we can plug this into (1.7) and obtain

$$-\rho V'(x) - \lambda V(x) + \lambda \int_0^{b-x} V(x+y) p(y) dy + \lambda \int_{b-x}^\infty (x+y-b+V(b)) p(y) dy - \delta V(x) = 0. \tag{1.8}$$

By C^1-fit, for $x = b$ we have

$$-\rho - \lambda V(b) + \lambda \int_0^\infty y p(y) dy - \delta V(b) = 0, \tag{1.9}$$

which gives us $V(b)$

$$V(b) = \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta}. \tag{1.10}$$

After the seminal works by Avanzi et. al. [4] on optimal dividends in the dual risk model, there have been many related works in the dual risk model. In [3], Avanzi et al. studied a dividend barrier strategy for the dual risk model whereby dividend decisions are made only periodically, but ruin is still allowed to occur at continuous time. Ng [12] studied a dual model with a threshold dividend strategy, with exponential interclaim times. In another related work, Afonso et al. [1], they studied the connections between dual and classical risk models and used that to compute various quantities of interest. Cheung and Drekic [8] considered the dividend moments in the dual risk model. They derived integro-differential equations for the moments of the total discounted dividends which can be solved explicitly assuming the jump size distribution has a rational Laplace transform. The expected discounted dividends assuming the profits follow a Phase Type distribution were

studied in Rodríguez et al. [14] . The Laplace transform of the ruin time, expected discounted dividends for the Sparre-Andersen dual model were derived in Yang and Sendova [15]. When there is a random delay for the innovations turned to profits, the dual risk model becomes time inhomogeneous and the ruin probabilities and the ruin time distributions are studied in Zhu [19].

Recently, Fahim and Zhu [9] considered the optimal investment on research and development to minimize the ruin probability for the dual risk model. Additional investment on a risky market index and the generalization to the state-dependent dual risk model was also considered in [9].

Except for the special case including when the probability density function of Y_i, $p(y)$ is an exponential function or a sum of exponential functions, in general, there is no closed-form formulas for the value function $V(x)$ defined in (1.5) and the no closed-formula for the optimal barrier b.

In this paper, we are going to focus on the asymptotics for the optimal dividend problem in the dual risk model. Even though the general problem does not yield closed-form formulas, the asymptotics are very explicit and intuitive. They also provide useful insights to help us understand better the nature of the optimal dividend problem in the dual risk model. For the optimal dividend problem in the dual risk model, we know that the optimal strategy is a barrier strategy. But in practice, shareholders prefer continuous dividend yield and most public companies do not use barrier dividend strategies. We will show that in some asymptotic regimes, continuous dividend yield strategy can be nearly optimal, even though not exactly optimal.

The paper has all the main results in the next section and all the proofs in the Appendix.

2. Main Results

It was assumed in Avanzi et al. [4] that $\rho < \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]$. Under this condition, $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau = \infty) > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_x[\tau] = \infty$. They also assume that $\delta > 0$.

In general, the optimal value $V(x)$ has no closed-form formulas. But in some special cases, e.g. when Y_i are exponentially distributed, the optimal value $V(x)$ and the optimal barrier b can be computed explicitly, see e.g. Avanzi et al. [4]. From Avanzi et al. [4] et al., when $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$, we have

$$V(x) = \frac{\lambda}{\nu}\frac{e^{rx} - e^{sx}}{(\rho r + \delta)e^{rb} - (\rho s + \delta)e^{sb}}1_{[0,b]}(x) + (V(b) + x - b)1_{(b,\infty)}(x), \tag{2.1}$$

where r, s are the solutions of

$$\rho\xi^2 + (\lambda + \delta - \nu\rho)\xi - \nu\delta = 0, \tag{2.2}$$

and the optimal b is given by

$$b = \frac{1}{r - s}\log\left(\frac{s}{r}\frac{\rho s + \delta}{\rho r + \delta}\right). \tag{2.3}$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $s > r$ and therefore from (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \frac{-(\lambda + \delta - \nu\rho) + \sqrt{(\lambda + \delta - \nu\rho)^2 + 4\rho\nu\delta}}{2\rho}, \\ r &= \frac{-(\lambda + \delta - \nu\rho) - \sqrt{(\lambda + \delta - \nu\rho)^2 + 4\rho\nu\delta}}{2\rho}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

If we assume that

$$\rho \geq \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1], \tag{2.5}$$

then $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau < \infty) = 1$, i.e., the ruin occurs with probability 1. Intuitively, it says that when you are certain that the company is going to get ruined, the optimal strategy to maximize the dividend payments to shareholders is to give all the surplus of the company to the shareholders immediately. Therefore, for the finite-horizon case, under assumption (2.5), we have the same conclusion. That is, for any $T > 0$,

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] = x. \tag{2.6}$$

Notice that the assumption (2.5) is satisfied when $\lambda \to 0$, or when $\rho \to \infty$. Therefore, these two asymptotics are trivial. We will study instead the $\lambda \to \infty$ asymptotics and the $\rho \to 0$ asymptotics.

Also notice that under the usual condition $\rho < \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$, $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau = \infty) > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_x[\tau] = \infty$. Therefore, if $\delta = 0$, then

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau} dD_t \right] = \infty. \tag{2.7}$$

That is because we can always choose a constant dividend payment strategy that is $D_t \equiv \hat{D}$, where $\hat{D} > 0$ is a positive constant chosen sufficiently small so that $\rho + \hat{D} < \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$. Then, let $\hat{\tau}$ be the ruin time of this wealth process with $D_t \equiv \hat{D}$, we have $\hat{\tau} < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathbb{E}_x[\hat{\tau}] = \infty$. Then, we have

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau} dD_t \right] \geq \hat{D} \mathbb{E}_x[\hat{\tau}] = \infty. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore, we expect that when $\delta \to 0$,

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau \wedge T} e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \to \infty. \tag{2.9}$$

We will study how fast the value function approaches to infinity as $\delta \to 0$. This is also of practical interest because the value function for generally distributed Y_i does not yield closed-form formula and the asymptotic behavior is particularly useful in the low interest-rate environment because a common choice of discount factor δ is by letting $\delta = r$, where $r > 0$ is the risk-free rate.

When $\delta = 0$, we have seen already from (2.7) that the value function is ∞. But we can also study the finite-horizon case with a finite horizon $T > 0$. In the finite-horizon case,

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau} dD_t \right] < \infty. \tag{2.10}$$

But from (2.7), it is clear that

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau} dD_t \right] \to \infty, \tag{2.11}$$

as $T \to \infty$. So we are interested to study how fast this approaches to ∞ as $T \to \infty$.

When $\delta \to \infty$, intuitively, it is clear that the company should pay all the surplus as dividends to the shareholders immediately because the cost of carry goes to infinity.

When $T \to 0$, there is little time to accumulate new wealth and what the company can pay to the shareholders is approximately the initial wealth of the company.

To summarize, in this paper, we will focus on the following asymptotic regimes: (i) Small δ regime; (ii) Large T regime; (iii) Small ρ regime; (iv) Large λ regime; (v) Large δ regime; (vi) Small T regime.

Here we use the notation $V(x;p)$ to emphasize the dependence of the value function V on the parameter p; for example for small δ regime we use $V(x;\delta)$. Throughout this paper, the standard notion $f \sim g$ is used to denote $\frac{f}{g}$ has limit equal to 1.

It is well known that, see e.g. Avanzi et al. [4], the optimal strategy for the optimal dividend problem

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \tag{2.12}$$

is a barrier strategy. But in practice, most of the companies pay quarterly dividends and the investors prefer continuous yield rather than the barrier dividend payments for the dual risk models. One of the interesting discoveries of our paper is that in many asymptotic regimes, one can find a nearly optimal strategy that pays the continuous dividend yield when the surplus of the company is sufficiently large. The nearly optimal strategy we will present does not pay any dividend until the surplus reaches a large value and then it starts to pay out dividend continuously. In other words, a start-up company should wait till it becomes a mature company and then pays out dividend continuously. This is consistent with the data in the real world. Many high-tech companies, after the successful IPO (Initial Public Offering), remain growth stocks and do not pay dividends for a very long period of time, until they get more mature, or sometimes in response to big shareholders and activists' demand, they start paying dividends continuously with dividend yields being constant, and the dividend yield usually increases modestly and consistently year over year. Therefore, the nearly optimal strategy we will present is more consistent with the real world data. It also suggests that the most commonly adopted dividend strategies in the corporate world may not be optimal, but at least, nearly optimal.

More precisely, we define our nearly optimal dividend strategy $D^{M,\epsilon}$ as follows:

Definition 1. *The strategy $D^{M,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{D}$ pays no dividend until $\tau_M := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \geq M\}$, i.e. the first time that the process jumps above M before the ruin time. After τ_M, a constant dividend yield $(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)$ is paid out to the shareholders.*

Let τ_0 be the ruin time of the process $X_t = x - \rho t + J_t$ with no dividends. Conditional on $\tau_M < \tau_0$, a constant dividend yield $(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)$ is paid out to the shareholders until the ruin time τ^ϵ, which is defined as

$$\tau^\epsilon := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t^\epsilon \leq 0\}, \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$dX_t^\epsilon = -\rho dt - (1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)dt + dJ_t^M, \tag{2.14}$$

with $X_0^\epsilon = X_{\tau_M}$ and $J_t^M := J_{\tau_M+t} - J_{\tau_M}$.

Let $\tau^{M,\epsilon}$ be the ruin time of the process with dividend strategy $D^{M,\epsilon}$. Then, when $\tau_M > \tau_0$, we have $\tau^{M,\epsilon} = \tau_0$ and when $\tau_M < \tau_0$, we have $\tau^{M,\epsilon} = \tau_M + \tau^\epsilon$.

We will show that for small δ , large T, and large λ regimes that for sufficiently large M and sufficiently small ϵ, $D^{M,\epsilon}$ is nearly optimal.

2.1. **Small δ Regime.** Let us consider the small δ asymptotics in this section. This is practically relevant when the interest rate is low, which is a new environment, e.g. after the 2008 financial crisis in the United States. Recall that $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > \rho$ so that $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau = \infty) > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_x[\tau] = \infty$. Therefore, by considering a constant dividend yield strategy, it easily follows that

$$V(x;\delta) = \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \to \infty, \qquad \text{as } \delta \to 0. \tag{2.15}$$

We are interested to see how fast it goes to ∞ as $\delta \to 0$.

To get some intuitions, let us first consider the case when $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$ so that there are explicit formulas for the optimal value function and the optimal barrier. Let us recall that for $x \leq b$,

$$V(x;\delta) = \frac{\lambda}{\nu}\frac{e^{rx} - e^{sx}}{(\rho r + \delta)e^{rb} - (\rho s + \delta)e^{sb}}, \tag{2.16}$$

where r, s are given by (2.4) and the optimal b is given by (2.3). Therefore, as $\delta \to 0$, we have $s \to 0$ and $r \to \nu - \frac{\lambda}{\rho}$ and $b \to \infty$.

By the definition of the optimal b, we have

$$\frac{r}{s}(\rho r + \delta)e^{br} = (\rho s + \delta)e^{bs}. \tag{2.17}$$

This implies that for $x \leq b$

$$V(x;\delta) = \frac{\lambda}{\nu}\frac{e^{rx} - e^{sx}}{\left(1 - \frac{r}{s}\right)(\rho r + \delta)e^{br}}. \tag{2.18}$$

Notice that

$$e^{br} = e^{\frac{r}{r-s}\log\left(\frac{s^2(\nu-r)}{r^2(\nu-s)}\right)} = \left(\frac{s^2(\nu-r)}{r^2(\nu-s)}\right)^{\frac{r}{r-s}} \sim \frac{\frac{\lambda}{\rho}s^2}{\nu(\nu-\frac{\lambda}{\rho})^2}, \tag{2.19}$$

as $\delta \to 0$. Therefore, we have

$$V(x;\delta) \sim \frac{\lambda(1 - e^{(\nu-\frac{\lambda}{\rho})x})}{r\nu(\rho\nu - \lambda)\frac{\lambda}{\rho}}\nu\left(\nu - \frac{\lambda}{\rho}\right)^2\frac{1}{s}, \tag{2.20}$$

as $\delta \to 0$.

Note that $s \sim \frac{\nu}{\lambda - \nu\rho}\delta$ as $\delta \to 0$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \delta V(x;\delta) = \frac{\lambda - \nu\rho}{\nu}(1 - e^{(\nu-\frac{\lambda}{\rho})x}). \tag{2.21}$$

For generally distributed Y_i, we provide some heuristic arguments. Notice that for the optimization problem

$$V(x;\delta) = \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right], \tag{2.22}$$

the optimal strategy is a barrier strategy, that is,

$$V'(x;\delta) = 1, \qquad \text{for any } x > b, \tag{2.23}$$

and for any $x < b$,

$$-\rho V'(x;\delta) + \lambda\int_0^\infty [V(x+y;\delta) - V(x;\delta)]p(y)dy - \delta V(x;\delta) = 0, \tag{2.24}$$

with $V(0;\delta) = 0$.

As $\delta \to 0$, the optimal $b \to \infty$. Therefore, for fixed x, we have $x \ll b$ and $V(x;\delta)$ roughly satisfies the equation:

$$-\rho V'(x;\delta) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [V(x+y;\delta) - V(x;\delta)]p(y)dy = 0, \tag{2.25}$$

with $V(0;\delta) = 0$, which yields that

$$V(x;\delta) \simeq c(1 - e^{-\alpha x}), \tag{2.26}$$

for some positive constant c, where α is the unique positive solution to the equation:

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{2.27}$$

Next, let us determine the positive constant c. Recall that by (1.10), for any $x > b$,

$$V(x;\delta) \simeq \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta} + (x - b). \tag{2.28}$$

This implies that for x fixed and large, $V(x;\delta)\delta \sim \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho$ as $\delta \to 0$. Hence, we have $c = \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho}{\delta}$ and

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \delta V(x;\delta) = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}). \tag{2.29}$$

Indeed, we can prove it rigorously:

Theorem 2. *We have the following asymptotic result for small δ:*

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \delta \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}). \tag{2.30}$$

Proposition 3. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\delta > 0$ be such that*

$$\left|\delta \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] - (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x})\right| \le \varepsilon. \tag{2.31}$$

Then, for sufficiently large M and sufficiently small ϵ, the $D^{M,\epsilon}$ is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}$ optimal strategy, i.e.,

$$\left|\delta\mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t^{M,\epsilon}\right] - (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x})\right| \le \varepsilon. \tag{2.32}$$

2.2. **Large T Regime.** Let us consider the large T asymptotics in this section. Denote the value function as

$$V(x;T) := \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right]. \tag{2.33}$$

Let us differentiate two cases: $\delta > 0$ and $\delta = 0$.

When $\delta > 0$, intuitively, it is clear that the finite-horizon value function will converge to the infinite-horizon value function as $T \to \infty$:

$$V(x;T) = \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \to \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right]. \tag{2.34}$$

Indeed, we can give an upper bound on the speed of the convergence and show rigorously the following result:

Theorem 4. *Assume $\delta > 0$, we have*

$$\left| V(x;T) - \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \right| \leq (x + \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]T)e^{-\delta T} + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta} e^{-\delta T}. \tag{2.35}$$

Next, let us consider the $\delta = 0$ case, i.e.

$$V(x;T) = \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t \right]. \tag{2.36}$$

Then, we expect that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{V(x;T)}{T} = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}). \tag{2.37}$$

We shall show this result rigorously later. Before we proceed, let us give some heuristic arguments and gain some intuition behind this result. Notice that when $\delta = 0$, the present value of the future dividends does not decay as the payment time evolves. Moreover, $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] > \rho$, so there is an upward drift and if the company holds the wealth rather than pay the dividends, there will be less chance that the company is going to get ruined. On the other hand, we have already seen that the value of the dividends do not decay over time because $\delta = 0$, therefore, the optimal strategy is not to pay any dividends until the time of the maturity T if by that time the company is not ruined. As $T \to \infty$, the probability that the company is not ruined is the ultimate survival probability, that is, $1 - e^{-\alpha x}$. On the other hand, ignoring ruing probability, by Dynkin's formula, we can compute that the expected wealth of the company at time T is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X_T] = x + \int_0^T \mathbb{E}_x[\mathcal{A}X_s]ds = x + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)T, \tag{2.38}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is the infinitesimal generator of the process X_t. So for large T, on average, $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho$ is the rate of the growth of the company. Therefore, we expect to get

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{V(x;T)}{T} = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}). \tag{2.39}$$

The rigorous result is as follows.

Theorem 5. *As $T \to \infty$, we have*

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t \right] = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho) \left[(1 - e^{-\alpha x})T + \frac{e^{-\alpha x}x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y} y p(y) dy} + o(1) \right]. \tag{2.40}$$

The optimal strategy when $\delta = 0$ is to withhold any dividend until $T \wedge \tau$. But in practice, that is not very realistic. Indeed, we will show that the $D^{M,\epsilon}$ strategy that pays continuous dividend yield after the surplus reaches above the level M is nearly optimal:

Proposition 6. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, let $T > 0$ be such that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{T} \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} dD_t \right] - (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}) \right| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2.41}$$

Then, for sufficiently large M and sufficiently small ϵ, the $D^{M,\epsilon}$ is an εT optimal strategy, i.e.,

$$\left|\frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} dD_t^{M,\epsilon}\right] - (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)(1-e^{-\alpha x})\right| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2.42}$$

2.3. **Large λ Regime.** Let us consider the large λ asymptotics in this section. This corresponds to the regime when the company has a large growth rate and fast expansions. For the moment, let us assume that Y_i are exponentially distributed, say $p(y)=\nu e^{-\nu y}$. Let us recall that for $x \geq b$ we have

$$V(x;\lambda) = x - b + V(b;\lambda). \tag{2.43}$$

Now as $\lambda\to\infty$, we can easily see from (2.4) that $s\to 0$ and $r\to-\infty$ and by (2.3) $b\to 0$. The asymptotics of the value function is fully determined by

$$V(b;\lambda) \sim \frac{\lambda}{\nu\delta}, \qquad \text{as } \lambda\to\infty. \tag{2.44}$$

More generally, we have

$$V(b;\lambda) \sim \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}, \qquad \text{as } \lambda\to\infty. \tag{2.45}$$

The intuition is the following. As $\lambda\to\infty$, the ruin probability will tend to zero. Let us assume that $X_0=x$. At any given time t, after a small time step Δt, the expected wealth increases to $x+(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\Delta t$, and then at time $t+\Delta t$, you immediately pay the amount $(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\Delta t$ to the shareholders and then you restart with wealth x and continue the process. By letting $\Delta t\to 0$, we get

$$V(x;\lambda) \sim (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t}dt = \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho}{\delta} \sim \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}. \tag{2.46}$$

Theorem 7. *(i) Assume that $\delta>0$. We have*

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right] \sim \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}, \qquad \text{as } \lambda\to\infty. \tag{2.47}$$

(ii) Assume $\delta>0$, for any $T>0$, we have

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right] \sim \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}(1-e^{-\delta T}), \qquad \text{as } \lambda\to\infty. \tag{2.48}$$

(iii) Assume $\delta=0$, for any $T>0$, we have

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t\right] \sim \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]T, \qquad \text{as } \lambda\to\infty. \tag{2.49}$$

The optimal strategy is always the barrier strategy. But in practice, shareholders prefer continuous dividend yield. Consider a dividend strategy $D^{M,\epsilon}$ from Definition 1 that pays continuous dividend yield $(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)$ after the surplus process hits above M. We will show that the $D^{M,\epsilon}$ strategy is nearly optimal:

Proposition 8. *Given any one of the cases in Theorem 7. For any $\varepsilon>0$, there exist some $M,\epsilon>0$ such that the $D^{M,\epsilon}$ strategy is $\varepsilon\lambda$-optimal.*

Remark 9. *It is also possible to have a discrete dividend strategy that is nearly optimal, see Remark 19.*

2.4. **Small ρ Regime.** Let us consider the small ρ asymptotics in this section. We will see that when $\rho = 0$, for any $x > 0$,

$$V(x;\rho) = x + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}. \tag{2.50}$$

The intuition is that since when $\rho \to 0$, the probability of ruin is negligible, and if $\delta > 0$, it is optimal to give almost all the surplus as dividends to the shareholders immediately rather than holding it. Then, each time the surplus increases, we also pay excess surplus as dividend. More precisely, for $\epsilon > 0$, let D^ϵ be the strategy which pays dividend $x - \epsilon$ at the beginning and any surplus above ϵ thereafter At time 0, with initial wealth x, you give $x - \epsilon$ dollars as amount of dividends to the shareholders. Then at time of the nth jump of the process J, $\tau^{(n)}$, the wealth grows to $Y_n + \epsilon$ and then you give Y_n as dividend. Therefore, when $\rho = 0$,

$$V(x;\rho) = x + \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] dt = x + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}. \tag{2.51}$$

To have a more rigorous proof, notice that for $x > b$, $V(x;\rho) = x - b + V(b;\rho)$. Recall from (1.10) that $V(b;\rho) = \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta}$. Hence for $\rho = 0$, we have (2.51). In fact, the optimal strategy for the finite horizon case should be the same.

Theorem 10. *Assume that $\rho = 0$.*

(i) For any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] = x + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}. \tag{2.52}$$

(ii) For any $\delta > 0$ and $T > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] = x + \frac{\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta} (1 - e^{-\delta T}). \tag{2.53}$$

(iii) For $\delta = 0$ and for any $T > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau} dD_t \right] = x + \lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] T. \tag{2.54}$$

Proposition 11. *Given any of the cases in Theorem 10. For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that the strategy D^ϵ is ε-optimal.*

For the special case when $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$, we can even find the second-order approximations as $\rho \to 0$. Let us recall that for $x > b$, $V(x;\rho) = x - b + V(b;\rho)$, where b is given by (2.3). From (2.4), it is easy that see that $r \sim \frac{-(\lambda+\delta)}{\rho}$ and $s \sim \frac{\nu\delta}{\lambda+\delta}$. This implies that

$$b \sim \frac{\rho}{-(\lambda+\delta)} \log \left(\frac{\nu\delta}{\lambda+\delta} \frac{-\rho}{\lambda+\delta} \frac{\delta}{-\lambda} \right) \sim \frac{-\rho \log \rho}{\lambda+\delta}, \tag{2.55}$$

as $\rho \to 0$. Hence, we conclude that for any $x > 0$,

$$V(x;\rho) \sim x + \frac{\lambda}{\nu\delta} + \frac{\rho \log \rho}{\lambda+\delta}, \tag{2.56}$$

as $\rho \to 0$.

2.5. **Large δ Regime.** Let us consider the large δ asymptotics in this section. When $\delta \to \infty$, intuitively, it becomes clear that if the company waits, the present value of the future dividends will be virtually zero because of the extreme discount factor. Therefore, it is easy to see that the optimal strategy is to give the surplus as the dividends to the shareholders sooner rather than later. Intuitively, one might guess that all the surplus should be given to the shareholders as the dividends at time zero and thus

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \sim x, \qquad \text{as } \delta \to \infty. \tag{2.57}$$

We will show later that this indeed is true. Moreover, we can obtain the second order approximations as $\delta \to \infty$ when Y_i are exponentially distributed.

Let us consider the special case when $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$. Then by (1.10), for any $x > b$, we have

$$V(x;\delta) = x - b + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta} = x - b + \frac{\frac{\lambda}{\nu} - \rho}{\delta}. \tag{2.58}$$

The optimal barrier b is given by (2.3). Then from (2.4), it is easy to see that $r \sim -\frac{\delta}{\rho}$ as $\delta \to \infty$ and $s \sim \nu$ as $\delta \to \infty$. Furthermore, we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho r + \delta &= \frac{-(\lambda + \delta - \nu\rho)}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{(\lambda+\delta-\nu\rho)^2 + 4\rho\nu\delta}}{2} + \delta \\ &= \frac{\delta - \lambda + \nu\rho - \sqrt{(\delta-\lambda+\nu\rho)^2 + 4\delta\lambda}}{2} \\ &= \frac{-2\delta\lambda}{\delta - \lambda + \nu\rho + \sqrt{(\delta-\lambda+\nu\rho)^2 + 4\delta\lambda}} \sim -\lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{2.59}$$

as $\delta \to \infty$. Therefore, plugging into (2.3), we get

$$b \sim \frac{\rho \log(\frac{\lambda}{\nu\rho})}{\delta}, \qquad \text{as } \delta \to \infty. \tag{2.60}$$

Hence, we conclude that for any $x > 0$,

$$V(x;\delta) = x - b + \frac{\frac{\lambda}{\nu} - \rho}{\delta} \sim x + \frac{1}{\delta}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\nu} - \rho - \rho\log\left(\frac{\lambda}{\nu\rho}\right)\right), \tag{2.61}$$

as $\delta \to \infty$.

We can indeed prove the first order approximation for generally distributed Y_i rigorously and have the following result:

Theorem 12.

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \sim x, \qquad \textit{as } \delta \to \infty. \tag{2.62}$$

2.6. **Small T Regime.** Let us consider the small T asymptotics in this section. When $T \to 0$, there is little time for the company to accumulate new wealth and thus all what the company can pay to the shareholders is roughly x. Within the small time interval $[0, T]$, for sufficiently small, the ruin probability is zero because ruin will not occur until after the time $\frac{x}{\rho}$. So on this short time interval, there is no ruin risk. For small T, it is easy to compute that $\mathbb{E}_x[X_T] = x + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)T$. For any dividend, the difference between paying the dividend at time 0 and the time at the time T is only a discount factor at most $e^{-\delta T}$. Since there is no ruin

risk, the initial wealth x should be given upfront as the dividends to shareholders. $(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)T$ is of order $O(T)$, and thus the impact of the discount factor on this amount of new wealth is of order $O(T^2)$ which is negligible. Therefore, we have the following result:

Theorem 13. *Assume that $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]>\rho$. As $T\to 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T}e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right]=x+(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)T+O(T^2). \tag{2.63}$$

3. Appendix: Proofs

3.1. Small δ Regime.

Proof of Theorem 2 and Proposition 3. (i) Let us first prove the upper bound.

Let us recall that

$$\min\left\{\delta V(x;\delta)+\rho V'(x;\delta)-\lambda\int_0^\infty[V(x+y;\delta)-V(x;\delta)]p(y)dy, V'(x;\delta)-1\right\}=0, \tag{3.1}$$

with $V(0)=0$.

Let us define $U(x):=\delta V(x;\delta)$ so that U satisfies

$$\min\left\{\delta U(x)+\rho U'(x)-\lambda\int_0^\infty[U(x+y)-U(x)]p(y)dy, U'(x)-\delta\right\}=0, \tag{3.2}$$

with $U(0)=0$.

We want to show that for $\delta>0$ sufficiently small,

$$U(x)\le U_1(x):=(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)(1-e^{-\alpha(\delta)x})+\delta x,$$

where $\alpha(\eta)$ is the largest positive root of

$$F(\alpha)=\alpha\rho-\lambda\int_0^\infty[e^{-\alpha y}-1]p(y)dy+\eta=0. \tag{3.3}$$

If $\eta>0$, $\alpha(\eta)$ exists. For $\eta<0$ sufficiently small, $F(\alpha)=0$ has at least one positive root. In addition, $\alpha(\delta)$ is a continuous function.

Let us show that $U\le U_1$. Consider an arbitrary admissible dividend strategy D_t, increasing càdlàg function with $D_0=0$.

$$\begin{aligned}U_1(x)&=\mathbb{E}_x[e^{-\delta(t\wedge\tau)}U_1(X_{t\wedge\tau})]\\&\quad+\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{t\wedge\tau}e^{-\delta s}\left(\rho U_1'(X_s)-\lambda\int_0^\infty[U_1(X_s+y)-U_1(X_s)]p(y)dy+\delta U_1(X_s)\right)ds\right]\\&\quad+\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{t\wedge\tau}e^{-\delta s}U_1'(X_s)dD_s\right]\\&\quad-\mathbb{E}_x\left[\sum_{s\le t\wedge\tau}e^{-\delta s}\left[U_1(X_{s+})-U_1(X_s)-U_1'(X_s)\Delta D_s\right]\right].\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Direct calculations shows that

$$\delta U_1 + \rho U_1' - \lambda \int_0^\infty (U_1(x+y) - U_1(x))p(y)dy = \delta x^2 \geq 0, \tag{3.5}$$

$$U_1'(x) \geq \delta. \tag{3.6}$$

Thus

$$U_1(x) \geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\delta(t\wedge\tau)} U_1(X_{t\wedge\tau}) \right] + \delta \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{t\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta s} dD_s^c \right]. \tag{3.7}$$

Notice that here we used $U_1' \geq \delta$, $\Delta D_s \geq 0$ and $X_{s+} \leq X_s$,

$$\sum_{s\leq t\wedge\tau} \left[U_1(X_{s+}) - U_1(X_s) - U_1'(X_s)\Delta D_s \right] e^{-\delta s} \leq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

By sending $t \uparrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$U_1(x) \geq \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\delta(t\wedge\tau)} U_1(X_{t\wedge\tau}) \right] + \delta \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right]. \tag{3.9}$$

Note that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\delta(t\wedge\tau)} U_1(X_{t\wedge\tau}) \right] = 0$. Thus, by taking supremum over $D \in \mathcal{D}$, we get

$$U_1(x) \geq \delta \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] = \delta V(x;\delta) = U(x). \tag{3.10}$$

From $U(x) \leq U_1(x)$, it follows that

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0} \delta V(x;\delta) \leq (\lambda \mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}). \tag{3.11}$$

(ii) Now let us consider the lower bound (the Proposition 3 will also follow). For any $M > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let us recall that the definition of the dividend strategy $D^{M,\epsilon}$ in Definition 1: no dividend is paid out until the first time that the process jumps above M and then it pays dividend with continuous rate $(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)$, and also recall the definitions of τ_M, X_t^ϵ, τ^ϵ, $\tau^{M,\epsilon}$, and τ_0. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{\tau^{M,\epsilon}} e^{-\delta t} dD_t^{M,\epsilon} \right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\delta\tau_M} 1_{\tau_M<\tau_0} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\tau^\epsilon} e^{-\delta t} (1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho) dt \middle| X_0^\epsilon = M \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\delta\tau_M} 1_{\tau_M<\tau_0} \right] (1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho) \frac{1}{\delta} \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\delta\tau^\epsilon} \middle| X_0^\epsilon = M \right] \right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where the second inequality above uses the simple fact that $X_{\tau_M} \geq M$ and a lower bound is given by starting $X_0^\epsilon = M$ rather than $X_0^\epsilon = X_{\tau_M}$. Notice that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\delta\tau^\epsilon} \middle| X_0^\epsilon = M \right] = \mathbb{P}(\tau^\epsilon < \infty | X_0^\epsilon = M), \tag{3.13}$$

and $u(x) := \mathbb{P}(\tau^\epsilon < \infty | X_0^\epsilon = x)$ satisfies the equation

$$-\rho u'(x) - (1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)u'(x) + \lambda \int_0^\infty [u(x+y) - u(x)]p(y)dy = 0, \tag{3.14}$$

with the boundary condition $u(0) = 1$, which implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau^\epsilon < \infty | X_0^\epsilon = M) = e^{-\alpha^{\delta,\epsilon} M}, \tag{3.15}$$

where α^ϵ is the unique positive value that satisfies the equation:

$$\rho\alpha^\epsilon - (1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)\alpha^\epsilon + \lambda \int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha^\epsilon y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\delta \tau_M} 1_{\tau_M < \tau} \right] = \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_M < \tau). \tag{3.17}$$

Hence, we have

$$\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \delta \sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \geq \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_M < \tau)(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha^\epsilon M}). \tag{3.18}$$

Since it holds for any $M > x$, we can let $M \to \infty$ and it follows that

$$\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \delta \sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \geq \mathbb{P}_x(\tau = \infty)(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho). \tag{3.19}$$

Finally, notice that $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau = \infty) = 1 - e^{-\alpha x}$ and it holds for any $\epsilon > 0$ and we can let $\epsilon \to 0$. That yields the desired lower bound. □

3.2. **Large T Regime.**

Proof of Theorem 4. For any $D \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] - \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \right| &= \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_{T \wedge \tau}^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_T^\infty e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

The total expected discounted dividends for $\rho \geq 0$ is bounded above by the case when $\rho = 0$. In the case when $\rho = 0$, there is no ruin risk and any surplus should be paid out immediately to the shareholders. Therefore, for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$, an upper bound of $\mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_T^\infty e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right]$ is given as follows. If no dividend is paid before time T then the expected value of the surplus at time T is $x + \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]T$ when $\rho = 0$ and that the surplus is paid out at time T, after which, any surplus is paid out immediately so that for any $D \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_T^\infty e^{-\delta t} dD_t \right] \leq (x + \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]T)e^{-\delta T} + \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] \int_T^\infty e^{-\delta t} dt, \tag{3.21}$$

which yields the desired result. □

Now let us turn to the proof of Theorem 5 which would be directly implied by Lemma 14 and Lemma 15. First, let us prove that the optimal strategy is not to pay any dividend until the maturity T if the company is not ruined by then and all the surplus at the maturity is given to the shareholders as the dividends.

Lemma 14.

$$\sup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau} dD_t \right] = \mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T \wedge \tau_0}], \tag{3.22}$$

where $X_t^0 := x - \rho t + J_t$ and let τ_0 be the ruin time of process X^0.

Proof. Let D be an arbitrary admissible dividend strategy such that $X_{T\wedge\tau} = 0$, where τ is the ruin time of process

$$dX_t = -\rho dt + dJ_t - dD_t, \text{ and } X_0 = x.$$

Then, define the dividend strategy $\tilde{D}$ by $\tilde{D}_t = 0$ for $t < T \wedge \tau_0$ and $\tilde{D}_{T\wedge\tau_0} = X^0_{T\wedge\tau_0}$. For $t < T$, we have $X_t = X^0_t - D_t$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t\right] = \mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau}] - \mathbb{E}_x[X_{T\wedge\tau}] = \mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau}]$$

On the other hand, since $\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho > 0$, X^0 is a submartingale and thus, $\mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau}] \leq \mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau_0}]$. Here we used the fact that $\tau_0 \geq \tau$. This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau_0}] = \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau_0} d\tilde{D}_t\right].$$

□

The above lemma asserts that when there is no discounting, paying surplus as dividend at the terminal time is an optimal strategy.This allows us to focus only on the terminal time dividend payment strategy. When the dividend is paid at terminal time, the expected dividend is equal to $\mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau_0}]$, which we will estimate in the next step as $T \to \infty$.

Lemma 15.

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau_0}] = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)\left[(1 - e^{-\alpha x})T + \frac{e^{-\alpha x}x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy} + o(1)\right], \tag{3.23}$$

as $T \to \infty$.

Proof. By Dynkin's formula, we can compute that

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X^0_{T\wedge\tau_0}] = x + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)\mathbb{E}_x[T \wedge \tau_0]. \tag{3.24}$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_x[T \wedge \tau_0] = \mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 \cdot 1_{\tau_0<T}] + T\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 > T). \tag{3.25}$$

By Lemma 16, which will be presented after this proof, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 \cdot 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] = \frac{x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy}. \tag{3.26}$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 > T) = \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 = \infty) = 1 - e^{-\alpha x}. \tag{3.27}$$

Hence, we proved that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\mathbb{E}_x[X_{T\wedge\tau_0}] = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(1 - e^{-\alpha x}). \tag{3.28}$$

Finally, notice that $\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 \cdot 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] < \infty$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 \cdot 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}_x(t \leq \tau_0 < \infty)dt < \infty, \tag{3.29}$$

which implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 \geq T) - \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 = \infty) = \mathbb{P}_x(T \leq \tau_0 < \infty) = o(T^{-1}), \tag{3.30}$$

as $T \to \infty$. Hence, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X_{T\wedge\tau_0}] = (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)\left[(1-e^{-\alpha x})T + \frac{e^{-\alpha x}x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy} + o(1)\right], \tag{3.31}$$

as $T \to \infty$. □

Lemma 16. *Under the condition that $\rho < \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 \cdot 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] = \frac{x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy}. \tag{3.32}$$

Proof. When $\mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 = \infty) > 0$, we can consider to compute

$$v(x) := \mathbb{E}_x[e^{-\theta\tau_0}1_{\tau_0<\infty}], \tag{3.33}$$

which satisfies the equation:

$$-\rho v'(x) + \lambda\int_0^\infty [v(x) - v(x)]p(y)dy - \theta v(x) = 0, \tag{3.34}$$

with the boundary condition $V(0) = 1$.

It is easy to see that $v(x) = e^{-\alpha(\theta)x}$, where $\alpha(\theta) > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:

$$\rho\alpha(\theta) + \lambda\int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha(\theta)y} - 1]p(y)dy - \theta = 0. \tag{3.35}$$

Differentiating with respect to θ, we get

$$\rho\alpha'(\theta) - \lambda\alpha'(\theta)\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha(\theta)y}yp(y)dy - 1 = 0. \tag{3.36}$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] = \alpha'(0)xe^{-\alpha(0)x}. \tag{3.37}$$

By letting $\theta = 0$ in (3.36), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] = \frac{e^{-\alpha x}x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy}, \tag{3.38}$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is the unique solution to the equation:

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda\int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{3.39}$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0|\tau_0 < \infty] = \frac{x}{\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy}. \tag{3.40}$$

□

Remark 17. *Note that $\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 \cdot 1_{\tau_0<\infty}] < \infty$ requires that the condition*

$$\rho - \lambda\int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha y}yp(y)dy > 0 \tag{3.41}$$

is satisfied. This can be easily checked as follows. Recall that α is the unique positive solution to the equation

$$\rho\alpha + \lambda\int_0^\infty [e^{-\alpha y} - 1]p(y)dy = 0. \tag{3.42}$$

Substituting (3.42) *into* (3.41)*, the condition* (3.41) *is equivalent to:*

$$\int_0^\infty [1 - e^{-\alpha y} - e^{-\alpha y}\alpha y]p(y)dy > 0. \tag{3.43}$$

Let $F(x) := 1 - e^{-x} - e^{-x}x$ *for* $x \geq 0$*. It is easy to compute that* $F(0) = 0$ *and* $F'(x) = e^{-x}x > 0$*, which implies that* $F(x) > 0$ *for any* $x > 0$ *and hence* (3.41) *holds.*

Remark 18. *In the case when* Y_i *are exponentially distributed, say* $p(y) = \nu e^{-\nu y}$ *for some* $\nu > 0$*, then, we can compute that* $\alpha = \frac{\lambda}{\rho} - \nu$ *and*

$$\mathbb{E}_x[\tau_0 | \tau_0 < \infty] = \frac{x}{\rho(1 - \frac{\rho\nu}{\lambda})}. \tag{3.44}$$

Proof of Proposition 6. For any $M > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let us recall the definitions of τ_M, X_t^ϵ, τ^ϵ, $\tau^{M,\epsilon}$, and τ_0. Following the similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2 and Proposition 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} dD_t\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau^{M,\epsilon}\wedge T} dD_t^{M,\epsilon}\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_M < \tau_0 \wedge T)(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)\mathbb{E}[\tau^\epsilon \wedge (T - \tau_M) | X_0^\epsilon = M, \tau_M < \tau_0 \wedge T] \\
&= \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_M < \tau_0 \wedge T)(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho) \\
&\qquad \cdot \Big(\mathbb{E}[(T - \tau_M)1_{\tau^\epsilon = \infty} | X_0^\epsilon = M, \tau_M < \tau_0 \wedge T] \\
&\qquad\qquad + \mathbb{E}[\tau^\epsilon \wedge (T - \tau_M)1_{\tau^\epsilon < \infty} | X_0^\epsilon = M, \tau_M < \tau_0 \wedge T]\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} dD_t\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_M < \tau_0)(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)\mathbb{P}(\tau^\epsilon = \infty | X_0^\epsilon = M).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\lim_{M\to\infty}\liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} dD_t\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{P}_x(\tau_0 = \infty)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho) = (1 - e^{-\alpha x})(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

□

3.3. **Large λ Regime.**

Proof of Theorem 7 and Proposition 8. (i) First, let us prove the upper bound. Notice that the optimal strategy is the barrier strategy with

$$V(x;\lambda) = x - b + V(b;\lambda), \qquad \text{for } x > b, \tag{3.47}$$

and $V'(x;\lambda) > 1$ for $x < b$ and $V(0;\lambda) = 0$. Therefore, it is easy to see that for $x < b$, we have $V(x;\lambda) \leq x - b + V(b;\lambda)$. On the other hand by (1.10), $V(b;\lambda) = \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho}{\delta}$. Therefore, for any x,

$$V(x;\lambda) \leq x - b + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta} \leq x + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta}. \tag{3.48}$$

This gives us the upper bound.

Next, let us prove the lower bound. For any $M > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let us recall that the definition of the dividend strategy $D^{M,\epsilon}$ in Definition 1: no dividend is paid out until the first time that the process jumps above M and then it pays dividend with continuous rate $(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)$, and also recall the definitions of τ_M, X_t^ϵ, τ^ϵ, $\tau^{M,\epsilon}$, and τ_0. Then,

(3.49)

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right] &\geq \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau^{M,\epsilon}} e^{-\delta t}dD_t^{M,\epsilon}\right]\\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau_M}1_{\tau_M<\tau_0}\right](1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau^\epsilon} e^{-\delta t}dt\middle| X_0^\epsilon = M\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau_M}1_{\tau_M<\tau_0}\right](1-\epsilon)\frac{(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)}{\delta}\left(1-\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\delta\tau^\epsilon}\middle| X_0^\epsilon = M\right]\right)\\ &= \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau_M}1_{\tau_M<\tau_0}\right](1-\epsilon)\frac{(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)}{\delta}\left(1-e^{-\beta^{\epsilon,\lambda}M}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta^{\epsilon,\lambda}$ is the unique positive value that satisfies the equation

$$\rho\beta^{\epsilon,\lambda}+(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\beta^{\epsilon,\lambda}+\lambda\int_0^\infty[e^{-\beta^{\epsilon,\lambda}y}-1]p(y)dy-\delta=0, \tag{3.50}$$

It is easy to check that $\beta^{\epsilon,\lambda}\to\beta^{\epsilon,\infty}$, where $\beta^{\epsilon,\infty}$ is the unique positive value that satisfies:

$$(1-\epsilon)\mathbb{E}[Y_1]\beta^{\epsilon,\infty}+\int_0^\infty[e^{-\beta^{\epsilon,\infty}y}-1]p(y)dy=0. \tag{3.51}$$

Since $\tau_M\to 0$ when $\lambda\to\infty$, it follows from bounded convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau_M}1_{\tau_M<\tau_0}\right]=1. \tag{3.52}$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda}\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right]\geq(1-\epsilon)\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}(1-e^{-\beta^{\epsilon,\infty}M}). \tag{3.53}$$

Finally, letting $M\to\infty$ first and then $\epsilon\to 0$, we get

$$\liminf_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda}\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right]\geq\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}. \tag{3.54}$$

(ii) Assume $\delta>0$ and $T>0$. Let us first prove the upper bound. Let

$$V(x,t;\lambda):=\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_t^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right]. \tag{3.55}$$

Then, $V(x,t)$ satisfies the equation:

(3.56)

$$\max\left\{\frac{\partial V}{\partial t}-\rho\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}+\lambda\int_0^\infty[V(x+y,t;\lambda)-V(x,t;\lambda)]p(y)dy-\delta V,-\frac{\partial V}{\partial x}+1\right\}=0,$$

with terminal condition $V(x,T;\lambda)=x$. Now define the function $U_1(x,t):=x+\frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho}{\delta}(1-e^{-\delta(T-t)})$ and consider an arbitrage dividend strategy $D\in\mathcal{D}$. Recall

that $dX_t = \rho dt + dJ_t - dD_t$. Thus, by Itô formula we obtain

(3.57)

$$\begin{aligned}U_1(x,0) = \mathbb{E}_x[e^{-\delta(T\wedge\tau)}U_1(X_{T\wedge\tau}, T\wedge\tau)] + \mathbb{E}_x\Bigg[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta s}\Big(- \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial t}(X_s,s) + \rho\frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x}(X_s,s)\\ - \lambda\int_0^\infty [U_1(X_s+y,s) - U_1(X_s,s)]p(y)dy + \delta U_1(X_s,s)\Big)ds\Bigg]\\ + \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta s}\frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x}(X_s,s)dD_s\right]\\ - \mathbb{E}_x\left[\sum_{s\le T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta s}\left[U_1(X_{s+},s) - U_1(X_s,s) + \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x}(X_s,s)\Delta D_s\right]\right].\end{aligned}$$

By direct calculation, the Riemann integral in the above and the term

$$\mathbb{E}_x[e^{-\delta(T\wedge\tau)}U_1(X_{T\wedge\tau}, T\wedge\tau)]$$

are non-negative. Also for the last term, we have

$$U_1(X_{s+},s) - U_1(X_s,s) - \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x}(X_s,s)\Delta D_s = 0.$$

Therefore, we can write

$$U_1(x,0) \ge \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta s}dD_s\right]$$

Taking supremum over $D\in\mathcal{D}$ gives us the desired upper bound.

Next, let us prove the lower bound. For any $0<\epsilon<1$, consider the strategy $D^{M,\epsilon}$ from Definition 1 that pays out dividend at constant rate $(1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)$ after the surplus hits above M. Then,

(3.58)

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right]\\ &\ge \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau_M}1_{\tau_M<\tau_0\wedge T}\right](1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{(T-\tau_M)\wedge\tau^\epsilon} e^{-\delta t}dt\,\middle|\, X_0^\epsilon = M, \tau_M<\tau_0\wedge T\right]\\ &= \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau_M}1_{\tau_M<\tau_0\wedge T}\right](1-\epsilon)(\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]-\rho)\\ &\qquad\qquad\cdot\frac{1}{\delta}\left(1-\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\delta((T-\tau_M)\wedge\tau^\epsilon)}\,\middle|\, X_0^\epsilon = M, \tau_M<\tau_0\wedge T\right]\right),\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

(3.59)

$$\liminf_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda}\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}}\mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t}dD_t\right] \ge (1-\epsilon)\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}\left(1-\mathbb{E}[e^{-\delta(T\wedge\tau^\epsilon)}|X_0^\epsilon = M]\right).$$

Now, first let $M\to\infty$ and then $\epsilon\to 0$, and follow the same arguments as in (i), we get the desired lower bound.

(iii) Assume $\delta = 0$ and $T > 0$. The upper bound is similar as in (ii) by using the function $U_1(x,t) := x + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)(T-t)$. We can show that

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t\right] \leq x + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)T. \tag{3.60}$$

The lower bound is similar as in (ii). We can show that

$$\liminf_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} dD_t\right] \geq (1-\epsilon)\mathbb{E}[Y_1]\mathbb{E}[T\wedge\tau^\epsilon | X_0^\epsilon = M]. \tag{3.61}$$

Now, letting $M\to\infty$, we have $\tau^\epsilon \to \infty$ in probability and by bounded convergence theorem, we have

$$\liminf_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^{T\wedge\tau} e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \geq (1-\epsilon)\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}T. \tag{3.62}$$

Since it holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, we get the desired lower bound. □

Remark 19. *Indeed, we can also have a nearly optimal discrete dividend strategy for the large λ regime as an alternative to the continuous dividend strategy D^ϵ defined in the proof of Theorem 7. Let us consider a particular strategy D^* which is a barrier strategy with barrier $x > 0$, the same as the initial surplus. Then,*

(3.63)

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] &\geq \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t^*\right] \\ &\geq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\tau_x^{(n)}\delta} 1_{N[\tau_x^{(n-1)}, \tau_x^{(n-1)}+\Delta t]\geq 1} 1_{Y_n > \rho\Delta t}(Y_n - \rho\Delta t)\right]\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_x^{(n)}$ is the n-th time that the process jumps above the threshold x and $\tau_x^{(0)} := 0$ and Y_n are i.i.d. distributed as Y_1 as before. Essentially, we provide a lower bound by counting the events that there is a jump occur before Δt after the process starts at x and that jump size is greater than $\rho\Delta t$ which guarantees that the process jumps above the threshold x and pays the dividend. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[1_{Y_1>\rho\Delta t}(Y_1 - \rho\Delta t)\right] \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left(\mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\tau_x^{(1)}\delta} 1_{N[0,\Delta t]\geq 1} 1_{\tau_x^{(1)} = \inf\{t>0: N_t = 1\}}\right]\right)^n.\end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

It is easy to compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x \left[e^{-\tau_x^{(1)}\delta} 1_{N[0,\Delta t]\geq 1} 1_{\tau_x^{(1)} = \inf\{t>0: N_t = 1\}}\right] &= \int_0^{\Delta t} e^{-\delta s} \lambda e^{-\delta s} ds \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{\delta+\lambda}\left[1 - e^{-(\lambda+\delta)\Delta t}\right],\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \geq \mathbb{E}\left[1_{Y_1>\rho\Delta t}(Y_1 - \rho\Delta t)\right] \frac{\frac{\lambda}{\delta+\lambda}\left[1 - e^{-(\lambda+\delta)\Delta t}\right]}{1 - \frac{\lambda}{\delta+\lambda}\left[1 - e^{-(\lambda+\delta)\Delta t}\right]}. \tag{3.66}$$

Therefore, for any $\Delta t > 0$, we have

$$\liminf_{\lambda\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \geq \frac{1}{\delta}\mathbb{E}\left[1_{Y_1>\rho\Delta t}(Y_1 - \rho\Delta t)\right]. \tag{3.67}$$

By letting $\Delta t \to 0$, we get the desired lower bound.

3.4. **Small ρ Regime.**

Proof of Theorem 10 and Proposition 11. (i) By our assumption, $\rho = 0$. Let $v(x) = x + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}$. Then, we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\left\{\lambda\int_0^\infty [v(x+y) - v(x)]p(y)dy - \delta v(x), 1 - v'(x)\right\} \\ &= \max\{-\delta x, 0\} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.68}$$

Therefore $v(x) = x + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}$ is a classical solution of the above problem. Classical verisifcation theorem such as [10, Theorem 8.4.1] shows that $v(x) \geq V(x;\rho)$ for $\rho = 0$. Thus, it is sufficient to show that there is a sequence of strategies $D^\epsilon \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t^\epsilon\right] = v(x).$$

Recall the strategy D^ϵ which pays dividend $x - \epsilon$ at the beginning and any surplus above ϵ thereafter. Then, the ruin never occurs and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^\tau e^{-\delta t} dD_t^\epsilon\right] &= x - \epsilon + \mathbb{E}_x\left[\sum_{n=1}^\infty e^{-\delta\tau^{(n)}} Y_n\right] = x - \epsilon + \mathbb{E}[Y_1]\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-\delta\tau^{(n)}}\right] \\ &= x - \epsilon + \mathbb{E}[Y_1]\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}_x\left[e^{-n\delta\tau^{(1)}}\right] = x - \epsilon + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta} \end{aligned}$$

where for $n \geq 1$, $\tau^{(n)}$ is the time of the nth jump of the process J. Thus, (2.52) holds.

(ii) For $\delta > 0$ and finite $T > 0$, let $v(t,x) = x + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}(1 - e^{-\delta(T-t)})$. Then $v(T,x) = x$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\left\{\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t,x) + \lambda\int_0^\infty [v(t,x+y) - v(t,x)]p(y)dy - \delta v(t,x), 1 - \frac{\partial}{\partial x}v(t,x)\right\} \\ &= \max\{-\delta x, 0\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $v(t,x) = x + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1]}{\delta}(1 - e^{-\delta(T-t)})$ is a classical solution. Therefore, one can repeat the above argument for function $v(t,x)$ to obtain (2.53).

(iii) When $\delta = 0$, the function $v(t,x) = x + \lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1](T-t)$ should be used to obtain (2.54). □

3.5. **Large δ Regime.**

Proof of Theorem 12. When the initial surplus is paid out completely at time 0, this strategy gives value x. Therefore, this gives us a lower bound.

Next, let us prove the upper bound. Notice that the optimal strategy is the barrier strategy with the optimal barrier b and for any x

$$V(x;\delta) \leq x - b + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta} \leq x + \frac{\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho}{\delta}. \tag{3.69}$$

This gives us the upper bound. □

3.6. **Small T Regime.**

Proof of Theorem 13. Let us first prove the upper bound. It is clear that

$$\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] \leq \sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} dD_t\right] = \mathbb{E}_x[X_{\tau\wedge T}] = \mathbb{E}_x[X_T], \tag{3.70}$$

for sufficiently small $T > 0$, since when there is no discount factor, it is never optimal to pay dividend and if no dividend is paid out, then the ruin time $\tau \geq \frac{x}{\rho} > T$ for T sufficiently small. We can easily compute that

$$\mathbb{E}_x[X_T] = x + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)T. \tag{3.71}$$

This gives us the upper bound. Now let us turn to the proof of the lower bound. Let us consider a dividend strategy D^ϵ such that $x-\epsilon$ is paid out at time 0 and then the remaining surplus is ϵ and no dividend is paid out. For any T that is sufficiently small so that $T < \frac{\epsilon}{\rho}$, then, ruin will not occur before time T, i.e., $\tau > T$. By considering this particular strategy, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{D\in\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} e^{-\delta t} dD_t\right] &\geq \mathbb{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\tau\wedge T} e^{-\delta t} dD_t^\epsilon\right] \\ &= x - \epsilon + e^{-\delta T}\left[\epsilon + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)T\right] \\ &= x - \delta T\epsilon + \epsilon O(T^2) + (\lambda\mathbb{E}[Y_1] - \rho)T + O(T^2),\end{aligned} \tag{3.72}$$

which holds for $T < \frac{\epsilon}{\rho}$. Take $\epsilon = 2\rho T$ for example will give us the desired lower bound. □

References

[1] Afonso, L. B., Cardoso, R. M. R. and A. D. Egídio dos Reis. (2013). Dividend problems in the dual risk model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **53**, 906-918.

[2] Albrecher, H., Badescu, A. and D. Landriault. (2008). On the dual risk model with tax payments. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **42**, 1086-1094.

[3] Avanzi, B., Cheung, E. C. K., Wong, B. and J. K. Woo. (2013). On a periodic dividend barrier strategy in the dual model with continuous monitoring of solvency. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **52**, 98-113.

[4] Avanzi, B., Gerber, H. U. and E. S. W. Shiu. (2007). Optimal dividends in the dual model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **41**, 111-123.

[5] Azcue, P. and N. Muler. (2009). Optimal investment strategy to minimize the ruin probability of an insurance company under borrowing constraints. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **44**, 26-34.

[6] Bayraktar, E. and M. Egami. (2008). Optimizing venture capital investment in a jump diffusion model. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*. **67**, 21-42.

[7] Cheung, E. C. K. (2012). A unifying approach to the analysis of business with random gains. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*. **2012**, 153-182.

[8] Cheung, E. C. K. and S. Drekic. (2008). Dividend moments in the dual risk model: exact and approximate approaches. *ASTIN Bulletin*. **38**, 399-422.

[9] Fahim, A. and L. Zhu. (2015). Optimal investment in a dual risk model. *arXiv:1510.04924*.

[10] Fleming, W. H. and H.M. Soner. *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.

[11] Gerber, H. U. (1979). *An Introduction to Mathematical Risk Theory*. S. S. Huébner Foundation Monograph, Series No. 8.

[12] Ng, A. C. Y. (2009). On a dual model with a dividend threshold. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **44**, 315-324.

[13] Ng, A. C. Y. (2010). On the upcrossing and downcrossing probabilities of a dual risk model with phase-type gains. *ASTIN Bulletin* **40**, 281-306.

[14] Rodríguez, E., Cardoso, R. M. R. and A. D. Egídio dos Reis. (2015). Some advances on the Erlang(n) dual risk model. *ASTIN Bulletin*. **45**, 127-150.
[15] Yang, C. and K. P. Sendova. (2014). The ruin time under the Sparre-Andersen dual model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. **54**, 28-40.
[16] Yang, H. and L. Zhang. (2005). Optimal investment for insurer with jump-diffusion risk process. *Insurnace: Mathematics and Economics*. **37**, 615-634.
[17] Wang, Z., Xia, J. and L. Zhang. (2007). Optimal investment for an insurer: The martingale approach. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **40**, 322-334.
[18] Zhu, L. (2015). A state-dependent dual risk model. Submitted.
[19] Zhu, L. (2015). A delayed dual risk model. Submitted.

Department of Mathematics
Florida State University
1017 Academic Way
Tallahassee, FL-32306
United States of America
E-mail address: fahim@math.fsu.edu, zhu@math.fsu.edu